1	BRIAN C. ANDERSON (State Bar No. 126539) O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP	
2	1625 Eye Street, NW Washington, D.C. 20006	
3	Telephone: (202) 383-5300 Facsimile: (202) 383-5414	
4	TROY M. YOSHINO (State Bar No. 197850)	
5	O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP	
6	Embarcadero Center West 275 Battery Street, 26th Floor	
7	San Francisco, CA 94111-3344 Telephone: (415) 984-8700 Facsimile: (415) 984-8701	
8	Attorneys for Defendant FORD MOTOR COMPANY	
10		
11	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
12	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
13	Oakland Division	
14		
	SUSAN CHAMBERLAN, BRIAN	Case No. C 03-02628 CW
15	CHAMPINE, and HENRY FOK, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly	FORD MOTOR COMPANY'S REQUEST
16	situated, and on behalf of the general public,	FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE IN SUPPORT OF REPLY TO PLAINTIFFS'
17	Plaintiffs,	OPPOSITION TO FORD'S MOTION TO DISMISS
18	V.	Date: August 1, 2003
19	FORD MOTOR COMPANY, and DOES 1	Time: 10:00 a.m. Courtroom: 2
20	through 100, inclusive,	Hon. Claudia Wilken
21	Defendants.	
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE ISO FORD'S REPLY TO PLAINTIFFS' OPPOSITION—Case No. C 03-02628 CW

1 REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE Defendant Ford Motor Company ("Ford") requests that the Court take judicial 2 notice of the legal effect of the document attached hereto as Exhibit A, which is a true and correct 3 copy of the Final Order and Judgment rendered in Howard v. Ford Motor Co., Case No. 753785-4 2 (Alameda Cty. Super. Ct. June 21, 2002) ("Final Judgment"). Judicial notice of this document 5 is proper pursuant to Federal Rule of Evidence 201. 6 Plaintiffs' opposition to Ford's Motion to Dismiss relies heavily on the October 7 11, 2000 Statement of Decision in Howard ("SOD"). See, e.g., Pl. Opp. at 4, 5, 7, 8. But 8 plaintiffs fail to mention that the Final Judgment entered in *Howard* expressly *vacated* the SOD. 9 See Exhibit A (Final Judgment ¶ 11). 10 The Final Judgment has been entered in the files of the Superior Court of the State 11 of California for Alameda County. This Court may take judicial notice of the legal effect of 12 documents contained in a state court's files. See, e.g., United States ex rel. Robinson Rancheria 13 Citizens Council v. Borneo, Inc., 971 F.2d 244, 248 (9th Cir. 1992) (taking judicial notice of state 14 court's final judgment for purposes of applying res judicata); Anderson v. Rinaldo, 1997 WL 15 46728, at *10 n.1 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 2, 1994). 16 Because plaintiffs present the SOD in a misleading light and fail to inform the 17 Court that the interim SOD was vacated by the Final Judgment, Ford requests that the Court take 18 judicial notice of the legal effect of the Final Judgment. 19 20 21 Dated: July 18, 2003 Respectfully submitted, 22 O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP 23 24 By /s/ Troy M. Yoshino Troy M. Yoshino 25 Attorneys for Defendant FORD MOTOR COMPANY 26 27 SF1:517392.1 28